

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference FADT0407PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION	
See item 4 below		
International application No. PCT/JP2004/006711	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 12 May 2004 (12.05.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 15 May 2003 (15.05.2003)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant ADVANTEST Corporation		

<p>1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).</p> <p>2. This REPORT consists of a total of 4 sheets, including this cover sheet.</p> <p>In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.</p>																	
<p>3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 85%; text-align: left; padding: 5px;">Box No. I Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;">Box No. II Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;">Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;">Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;">Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;">Box No. VI Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;">Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: left; padding: 5px;">Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table> <p>4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis.2).</p>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I Basis of the report	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I Basis of the report																
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II Priority																
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention																
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI Certain documents cited																
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application																
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application																

<p style="text-align: right;">Date of issuance of this report 16 March 2006 (16.03.2006)</p>	
<p>The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland</p> <p>Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35</p>	<p>Authorized officer Yoshiko Kuwahara</p> <p>Telephone No. +41 22 338 90 90</p>

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

PCT

Translation

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference FADT0407PCT		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/JP2004/006711	International filing date (day/month/year) 12.05.2004	Priority date (day/month/year) 15.05.2003	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC			
Applicant ADVANTEST Corporation			

<p>1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Box No. I</td> <td colspan="10">Basis of the opinion</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td colspan="10">Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td colspan="10">Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td colspan="10">Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td colspan="10">Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td colspan="10">Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td colspan="10">Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td colspan="10">Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Box No. I	Basis of the opinion											Box No. II	Priority											Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability											Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention											Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement											Box No. VI	Certain documents cited											Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application											Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																	
	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion																																																																																																										
	Box No. II	Priority																																																																																																										
	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																																																																																																										
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																																																																																																										
	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																																																																																																										
	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																																																																																																										
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																																																																																																										
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																																																																																																										
<p>2. FURTHER ACTION</p> <p>If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.</p> <p>If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.</p> <p>For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.</p>																																																																																																												
<p>3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.</p>																																																																																																												

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/006711

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 a sequence listing
 table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 in written format
 in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 contained in the international application as filed.
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/006711

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																									
<p>1. Statement</p> <table> <tr> <td>Novelty (N)</td> <td>Claims</td> <td>4</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Claims</td> <td>1, 2, 3, 5, 6</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inventive step (IS)</td> <td>Claims</td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Claims</td> <td>1-6</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Industrial applicability (IA)</td> <td>Claims</td> <td>1-6</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Claims</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> </table>			Novelty (N)	Claims	4	YES		Claims	1, 2, 3, 5, 6	NO	Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES		Claims	1-6	NO	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-6	YES		Claims		NO
Novelty (N)	Claims	4	YES																							
	Claims	1, 2, 3, 5, 6	NO																							
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES																							
	Claims	1-6	NO																							
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-6	YES																							
	Claims		NO																							
<p>2. Citations and explanations:</p> <p>Document 1: CD-ROM of the specification and drawings annexed to the written application of Japanese Utility Model Application No. 5-48901 (Laid-open No. 7-14389), (Advantest Corp.), 10 March, 1995 (10.03.95)</p> <p>Document 2: Microfilm of the specification and drawings annexed to the written application of Japanese Utility Model Application No. 61-77758 (Laid-open No. 62-189669), (Advantest Corp.), 2 December, 1987 (02.12.87)</p> <p>The subject matters of claims 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 do not appear to be novel or to involve an inventive step in view of the disclosure of document 1 cited in the ISR.</p> <p>The subject matter of claim 4 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1 and 2. Document 2 describes controlling the generation of sweep by a sweep gate signal C which boots up later by time Dt1 than an intermittent signal B does (page 5, lines 9 to 17, Fig. 2). Since the sweep gate signal C boots up after the intermittent signal B boots up and later than the intermittent signal B by time Dt1, and the intermittent signal B and the control signal A are synchronized, it is clear that the section in which the sweep gate signal C boots up can be generated by taking the logical product of the control signal A and the signal which delays the control signal A. Consequently, in the spectrum analyzer described in document 1, a person skilled in the art could have easily generated the section in which the sweep gate signal boots up by taking the logical product of the signal which delays the synchronizing signal 53 synchronized with the intermittent signal and the synchronizing signal 53 as the sweep gate signal for observing the intermittent signal (burst signal).</p>																										